

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 24, 2002

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Bill Young and Shannon Pogue; and Alternate Planning Commissioner Steven Olson.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks, Associate Planner Sambo Kirkman, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Associate Planner Veronica Smith, Senior Transportation Planner Don Gustafson, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item.

HENRY KANE discussed the 114th Avenue Redevelopment Project, observing that his review of the files has not indicated that this involves an Urban Renewal Project. He pointed out that several potential alternatives exist, including a Local Improvement District (LID), emphasizing that these options should not require public subsidization.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

On question, staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

OLD BUSINESS:

Chairman Voytilla opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

7:05 p.m. – Observing that he is a member of staff of the Beaverton School District, Chairman Voytilla recused himself from participating on tonight's agenda item, passed the gavel to Vice-Chairman Barnard, and stepped down from the dais.

CONTINUANCES:**A. CUP 2001-0031 – BEAVERTON HIGH SCHOOL CAFETERIA AND PARKING LOT EXPANSION**

(Continued from March 20, 2002)

The following land use applications have been submitted to construct a new two-level, 30,000-square foot cafeteria building located directly north of and connecting to the existing high school building. The proposed project is an expansion of an existing conditional use. Educational institutions, including public, private or parochial academic schools are identified specifically as a conditional use within the R-10 zone. The development proposal is located at 13000 SW 2nd Street; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-16AD, on Tax Lots 11100, 11000, 02900, 07100 and 10900 and 1S116AC, on Tax Lots 02100 and 02500. The site is zoned Urban Low Density (R-10) and is approximately 27 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Section 40.05.15.2.C.

Commissioner Maks disclosed that he is a former member of the Beaverton School District's Long-Range Facilities Group and had been involved in the projects involved in the last bond measure, adding that he is technically an elected official of the district. He clarified that his constituency is Southridge High School, noting that he serves as Chairman of the Southridge High School Local School Committee and was elected to this position in March 2001. Pointing out that his daughter is currently a student at Beaverton High School, he emphasized that none of these disclosures would affect his ability to be fair and impartial with regard to making a decision on this particular application.

Commissioner Pogue disclosed that he had attended the Incoming Freshman Night at Beaverton High School and that he had reviewed some of the drawings and information with regard to this project, observing that this would not affect

1 his ability to make a fair and impartial decision with regard to this particular
2 application.

3
4 On question, Associate Planner Sambo Kirkman advised Vice-Chairman Barnard
5 that no film of the site is available.

6
7 Indicating that he had visited and been involved in several other land use actions
8 involving this site, Commissioner Johansen pointed out that as a former student of
9 Beaverton High School, he is generally familiar with the site.

10
11 Observing that he had attended a baseball game on the site this afternoon,
12 Commissioner Young stated that he is familiar with the site.

13
14 Commissioner Bliss mentioned that he had visited the site and had no contact
15 with any individual with regard to this application.

16
17 Noting that he had made several visits to the site prior to the recent Street
18 Vacation application, Commissioner Maks noted that he drops off his daughter at
19 the school on a regular basis and is very familiar with the site.

20
21 Commissioner Pogue mentioned that he had visited and is familiar with the site
22 and has had no contact with any individual with regard to this application.

23
24 Vice-Chairman Barnard stated that he had visited the site prior to the recent Street
25 Vacation application and on numerous other occasions and is very familiar with
26 this site.

27
28 Associate Planner Kirkman presented the Staff Report and briefly described the
29 request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the expansion of the existing
30 Beaverton High School Campus, including the construction of a 30,000-square
31 foot two-story cafeteria building, three parking lots and other associated site
32 modifications. Concluding, she recommended approval of the application and
33 offered to respond to questions.

34
35 Referring to Section 60.20.10.5 (Parking Tables) on page 10 of the Staff Report,
36 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of the projected numbers of
37 students and staff with regard to the parking requirement.

38
39 Ms. Kirkman clarified that the projected numbers are 2200 students and 200 staff.

40
41 Senior Transportation Planner Don Gustafson explained that the determination of
42 the parking requirements is based upon a student count that actually includes both
43 students and staff.

44
45 Commissioner Johansen referred to page 11 of the Staff Report with regard to the
46 ten percent parking reduction, requesting clarification of whether the

1 Development Code provides that approval of the design is only one of the criteria
2 that must be addressed, emphasizing that other criteria must be met prior to the
3 Commission even considering granting this ten percent parking reduction.
4

5 Mr. Gustafson responded that the property owner is required to provide a parking
6 analysis demonstrating to the City's satisfaction that the vehicle parking demand
7 for the existing or proposed use will be met with the reduction in place.
8

9 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that this suggests that if the design
10 is approved by both Tri-Met and the City of Beaverton, the ten percent parking
11 reduction would be permitted with no further need to demonstrate compliance
12 with any additional criteria. He pointed out that all of the criteria included in
13 Section 60.20.10.10.A.2 must be met in order for the Commission to consider
14 granting the parking reduction.
15

16 Vice-Chairman Barnard questioned whether a conditional approval would be
17 necessary based upon whether that action is actually met.
18

19 Commissioner Maks clarified that historically, the adoption of a CUP is also
20 adopting the parking and other associated issues as proposed by the applicant in
21 the application, emphasizing that a specific Condition of Approval is not
22 necessary unless the Commission desires to specify a minimum and maximum
23 amount of parking spaces.
24

25 Referring to Section 60.20.10.5 (Places of Assembly), Development Services
26 Manager Steven Sparks pointed out that the parking ratio for a high school relates
27 to the number of both FTE students and staff.
28

29 Commissioner Johansen noted that he interprets this as indicating that the base-
30 parking requirement, based upon 2400 total students and staff, is 480 parking
31 spaces, as opposed to the 440 parking spaces indicated in the Staff Report.
32

33 **APPLICANT:**
34

35 **VLAD VOYTILLA**, representing the Facilities Department of the Beaverton
36 School District, observed that the applicant has reviewed the Staff Report and
37 concurs with the recommended Conditions of Approval. Noting that the applicant
38 would provide a brief presentation, he introduced Frank Angelo, the Planning
39 Consultant, adding that the Traffic Consultant, the Landscape Consultant and
40 various other consultants are also available to respond to questions.
41

42 **FRANK ANGELO**, representing *Angelo, Eaton & Associates* on behalf of the
43 Beaverton School District, reiterated that the applicant concurs with staff's
44 recommendation with regard to this application and expressed his opinion that the
45 applicant's proposal complies with the City of Beaverton's requirements for a
46 CUP. He provided a brief overview of the site plan, pointing that that one of the

1 goals is to provide adequate parking for buses. He described the location of the
2 existing Beaverton High School as it relates to the proposed cafeteria and parking
3 lot expansion for this facility. Observing that only the access to the parking area
4 on the east side would be gated and would be closed for campus security purposes
5 throughout the school day, he clarified the location of the parking lots and number
6 of parking spaces that would be available with this proposal. Pointing out that the
7 proposed 432 parking spaces should be adequate for both students and staff, he
8 expressed his opinion that the application meets the eligibility requirements for
9 the ten percent parking reduction. He noted that the applicant is proposing a
10 pedestrian amenity or shelter plaza at the intersection of SW Farmington Road
11 and SW Stott Street, adding that there have been negotiations with Tri-Met with
12 regard to the design of this facility, which would be approximately 300 square
13 feet in size.
14

15 Mr. Angelo discussed the parking of school buses, observing that this would
16 occur both on SW Erickson Street and on SW Stott Street. He mentioned that ten
17 of these buses would park on the east side of SW Erickson Street in the
18 northbound direction and eleven buses would park in the west side of SW Stott
19 Street in the southbound direction. Referring to an illustration depicting the
20 proposed bus parking, he noted that the cross section on the left is SW Erickson
21 Avenue at the entrance to the driveway. He mentioned that the applicant is
22 providing bulb outs and curb extensions in an effort to provide some protection
23 for the buses, adding that these vehicles would be parking very closely nose to
24 end in order to provide no opportunity for students to run between the buses.
25 Observing that crosswalks would be provided on SW Erickson Street, he
26 explained that speed tables would operate as crosswalks as well. He described the
27 raised speed humps, which would be flat on top, adding that these would be
28 located at the intersection SW Erickson Avenue and the entrance to the new
29 parking area, and as well as across from the parking lot at the entrance to the
30 football stadium.
31

32 Mr. Angelo explained that no parking would be allowed on the east side of SW
33 Erickson Street during school hours, adding that the general public would be
34 allowed to park in this area after school hours and on weekends. He pointed out
35 that 122 parking spaces would be provided for bicycles, emphasizing that the
36 overall intent of these improvements is the creation of an urban campus, with an
37 attractive pedestrian crossing between SW Erickson Street and SW Stott Street, as
38 well as an attractive streetscape. He provided copies of illustrations of the street
39 sections, reiterating that the applicant has met the City of Beaverton's applicable
40 requirements for a CUP. Concluding, he requested approval of the application
41 and offered to respond to questions.
42

43 Commissioner Young mentioned the 311 parking spaces is provided on-site,
44 adding that the applicant is projecting to provide 432 parking spaces on-site as the
45 change occurs. He requested clarification of whether the existing spaces that

1 would be lost within the public right-of-way would be subtracted from the total of
2 the increased parking spaces or whether these had already been subtracted.

3
4 Mr. Angelo advised Commissioner Young that public street parking has not been
5 included in any of the projections.

6
7 Commissioner Young emphasized that he is attempting to determine the net gain
8 in parking spaces.

9
10 Vice-Chairman Barnard pointed out that public parking spaces could not be
11 included within the required criteria, explaining that it is necessary for the
12 applicant to demonstrate only on-site parking.

13
14 Mr. Angelo noted that 311 parking spaces are currently available, adding that the
15 net increase in parking is 121 spaces, for a total of 432 parking spaces. He
16 emphasized that this is on-site parking and does not include the parking available
17 on SW Erickson Street or SW Stott Street.

18
19 Commissioner Young reiterated that he is curious with regard to the net increase
20 of on-site parking spaces, and requested clarification of how many public spaces
21 would be lost with this proposal.

22
23 Mr. Angelo advised Commissioner Young that he does not have this information.

24
25 Mr. Voytilla pointed out that this is not included within the applicable criteria.

26
27 Referring to the proposed pedestrian plaza on the corner of SW Farmington Road
28 and SW Stott Street, Commissioner Young questioned whether this has been
29 designed to the point where it is possible to determine what this facility would
30 look like.

31
32 Observing that Gary Alfson of *Harper Houf Righellis, Inc.* is working on this
33 issue with Ben Baldwin of Tri-Met, Mr. Angelo pointed out that the design of the
34 proposed pedestrian plaza has not yet been determined.

35
36 Commissioner Young emphasized that he is curious with regard to whether there
37 is any intention of providing access for individuals utilizing public transit from
38 buses on SW Farmington Road traveling both westbound and eastbound.

39
40 **GARY ALFSON**, representing *Harper Houf Righellis, Inc.* on behalf of the
41 applicant, pointed out that the pedestrian plaza would primarily serve buses
42 traveling eastbound on SW Farmington Road.

43
44 Mr. Voytilla pointed out that this pedestrian plaza would be located directly east
45 of the signalized intersection at SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, noting that this is not
46 a controlled intersection. He noted that with a mid-block crossing on SW

1 Farmington Road, a safe pedestrian route for individuals riding the westbound
2 buses would not be available.

3
4 Commissioner Bliss requested clarification of the discrepancy between the 436
5 parking spaces referenced in the application and the 432 parking spaces
6 mentioned in all of the testimony that has been received.

7
8 Pointing out that there had been some revisions, Mr. Angelo clarified that the
9 correct number of parking spaces is 432, including the requested ten percent
10 parking reduction.

11
12 Commissioner Johansen requested information with regard to public transit that
13 would serve the proposed pedestrian plaza.

14
15 Mr. Angelo advised Commissioner Johansen that the headways on SW
16 Farmington Road are 15 minutes.

17
18 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether any evidence indicates that the
19 presence of this proposed pedestrian plaza would generate any transit usage along
20 this route, noting that this could reduce the parking demand.

21
22 Mr. Voytilla clarified that one of the features of this proposed facility, beyond
23 utilization as a cafeteria, is that it is large enough to accommodate conferences,
24 adding that the applicant intends individuals attending conferences and meetings
25 scheduled at this facility would have the option of utilizing public transit.

26
27 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether a parking analysis based upon this
28 different use had been prepared.

29
30 Mr. Voytilla informed Commissioner Johansen that this issue had been
31 considered, emphasizing that this option is available for any of the district's
32 facilities that provide for multiple uses.

33
34 Commissioner Johansen requested information with regard to current utilization
35 of public transit by both students and staff.

36
37 Mr. Voytilla pointed out that although this information is available, he does not
38 have it with him at this time.

39
40 Referring to the Development Code, Commissioner Johansen mentioned that one
41 of the requirements for consideration of the parking reduction is parking analysis
42 demonstrating adequate demand, adding that he had not found any parking
43 analysis within any of the documents that had been provided.

44
45 Mr. Angelo explained that the overall parking requirements had been reviewed,
46 noting that the projected 2200 students had been there historically prior to the

1 opening of Southridge High School and pointed out that parking at that time had
2 been adequate.

3
4 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether adequate is intended to indicate that
5 the parking had not spilled out of the district's lots into the neighborhoods.

6
7 Mr. Angelo responded that it is his understanding that the parking at the site had
8 not gone beyond the district's lots, expressing his opinion that the additional 122
9 parking spaces is more than adequate to accommodate the projected enrollment
10 and employment at the site.

11
12 Mr. Voytilla noted that at that time, the district had also utilized portable
13 classrooms, observing that these structures were located on the parking lots,
14 emphasizing that these particular parking spaces were not effectively in use at the
15 time.

16
17 Commissioner Johansen expressed his recollection of Friday night football games
18 is that parking definitely spills over down SW 6th Street, adding that he has
19 personally observed and heard comments from some of the neighbors with regard
20 to this issue.

21
22 Referring to the Development Code with regard to parking requirements at high
23 schools, Mr. Voytilla pointed out that many of the high schools in the
24 metropolitan area do not have on-site parking that is adequate to accommodate
25 sporting events, particularly with regard to a team that is experiencing a good
26 season.

27
28 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that a parking reduction should be
29 based upon a real issue, rather than a pedestrian plaza that would not contribute
30 towards a reduction in the parking demand.

31
32 Mr. Angelo pointed out that in terms of the proposed parking reduction, the
33 school has a permit process that provides them with the ability to control the
34 number of students permitted to utilize the parking lots. He mentioned that the
35 district's requirement to provide busing to all students who reside a mile or more
36 from the school creates alternative transportation and reduces the demand on the
37 parking.

38
39 Expressing his appreciation of the parking permit process, Commissioner Bliss
40 pointed out that this involves on-site parking, adding that once all of the permits
41 are issued, there would still be additional students who wish to drive their own
42 vehicles to and from school.

43
44 Observing that this would involve parking on public property, Mr. Angelo noted
45 that the district has no means to address this issue.
46

1 Commissioner Bliss emphasized that he has a problem with approving a parking
2 reduction without having access on all information with regard to the proposal,
3 specifically the pedestrian plaza. He noted that if this pedestrian plaza is not
4 functional, then the Commission would have approved a proposal based upon
5 something that is not going to occur.

6
7 Commissioner Johansen mentioned that the applicant has stated that parking for
8 ten buses would be available northbound on SW Erickson Street and requested
9 clarification of the number of buses that would travel through that area during the
10 a.m. peak period.

11
12 Mr. Voytilla explained that while the district has not reached the anticipated
13 student level of 2,200 students, adding that the buses could be purposely
14 staggered to make certain that only several of the buses load or unload at any
15 given time. He noted that parking has been proposed for ten buses on SW Stott
16 Street and eleven buses on SW Erickson Street, adding that the district has a
17 variety of options available for controlling the bus traffic and parking. On
18 question, he informed Commissioner Johansen that parking would be available to
19 accommodate all of the buses traveling northbound on SW Erickson Avenue.

20
21 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of why it is necessary to provide
22 space for all ten buses at the same time, observing that in exchange for not
23 stopping traffic, public parking is being eliminated. He pointed out that because
24 all of these buses should not be at that location at the same time, it should only be
25 necessary to provide adequate room for three or four buses.

26
27 Mr. Voytilla explained that there would be occasions in which it would be
28 necessary for all ten buses to park in that location at the same time, emphasizing
29 that the district is also required to provide the ability to remove the students from
30 the school in the event of an emergency situation.

31
32 Commissioner Johansen questioned whether the Traffic Study has fully accounted
33 for the buses that would be traveling north on SW Erickson Street and turning
34 either left or right, rather than traveling east on SW 2nd Street. Referring to Figure
35 2 of the Traffic Study with regard to peak hour traffic volumes, he pointed out
36 that one additional left turn and 17 additional right turns would be created and that
37 at least ten additional bus trips accessing that intersection would be generated.

38
39 **CARL SPRINGER**, representing *DKS Associates* on behalf of the applicant,
40 responded to Commissioner Johansen's question, indicating that only eight
41 additional non-bus-related trips would be accessing that particular intersection, as
42 opposed to traveling east on SW 2nd Street.

43
44 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that while he has no evidence to
45 the contrary, eight non-bus-related trips appears to be a low figure considering the
46 amount of traffic currently traveling this same route at that time.

1 Commissioner Maks referred to the discussion with Mr. Springer with regard to
2 the Street Vacation, observing that due to the locations of the additional parking
3 and the new parking on the other side, the flow of the traffic has shifted, creating
4 more route and more vehicles traveling on SW 5th Street towards SW Stott Street,
5 resulting in a decrease in the amount of traffic on SW Erickson Street.

6
7 Commissioner Johansen mentioned that there would also be traffic patterns
8 created by the vehicles dropping off individuals, adding that these traffic patterns
9 would not be dictated by the parking lots.

10
11 Mr. Springer explained that there would be a net difference of a very small
12 amount of vehicles to the movement, pointing out that ten buses are generally
13 going to turn right, rather than left.

14
15 Commissioner Maks expressed concern that the majority (70%) of the drop-offs
16 occur on SW Erickson Street.

17
18 Commissioner Johansen observed that this intersection is Level of Service "F" for
19 the northbound left turn movement, with a delay greater than 50 seconds. He
20 questioned whether the Traffic Model takes into account that buses, rather than
21 cars, are involved, emphasizing that these vehicles take longer to pull in and pull
22 out and stack further back through the intersection and could block access to the
23 left turn lane.

24
25 Mr. Springer advised Commissioner Johansen that the analysis had indicated a
26 change in the vehicle queue, observing that this had involved one additional
27 vehicle. He emphasized that the majority of the buses would be turning right,
28 pointing out that a left turn at this location would be difficult and would not be
29 appropriate for the district's routing.

30
31 Observing that a certain amount of cost is involved in operating each of these
32 buses, Mr. Voytilla pointed out that the district makes every effort to utilize these
33 resources efficiently.

34
35 Mr. Springer expressed his opinion that one additional vehicle to a queue is not
36 significant.

37
38 Mr. Voytilla mentioned that the City of Beaverton has been suffering for a long
39 time due to incremental additions to failing intersections, emphasizing that at
40 some point, this does become a significant issue.

41
42 Commissioner Maks questioned where the special education buses would be
43 traveling.

44

1 Referring to an illustration, Mr. Angelo indicated that the special education buses
2 would be entering off of SW Erickson Street and loading and unloading students
3 within the traffic circle.

4
5 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of where the buses would be located
6 on SW Erickson Street.

7
8 Mr. Angelo advised Commissioner Maks that three buses would be located north
9 of the entrance to the driveway and eight buses would be located to the south
10 between the stadium and the entrance to the driveway.

11
12 Commissioner Maks emphasized that the majority of the students at Beaverton
13 High School do not utilize public transit, pointing out that 70% of the road is
14 outside of the attendance area. He noted that he questions what is needed for
15 parking as it relates to what is required by the Development Code, adding that he
16 is not certain that he approves of eliminating public parking from 7:30 a.m. until
17 2:30 p.m. Observing that a primary issue with him involves the drop off, he noted
18 that although this could probably be addressed, he had been less concerned when
19 it had appeared that only 110 cars would be traveling through this area. Noting
20 that the horizontal parking situation adds to traffic congestion, he questioned the
21 number of parking spaces located within this turnaround area.

22
23 Mr. Springer informed Commissioner Maks that 35 horizontal parking spaces are
24 located within the turnaround area.

25
26 Commissioner Maks pointed out that these 35 parking spaces provides 35
27 opportunities for vehicles to take up to two minutes to park within a parking stall,
28 emphasizing that the peak traffic time at a high school is a span of approximately
29 20 minutes. He mentioned that the school could address this issue by allowing
30 these parking spaces to be utilized prior to 7:15 a.m., adding that this parking is
31 actually restricting the adequate functioning of that turnaround area. Observing
32 that a student would be attempting to park a Buick in a space that barely has
33 adequate space for a sub-compact car, he noted that there would also be the mini-
34 buses that provide transportation for the students with special needs, who often
35 require additional time to reach their destinations, which also delays the traffic
36 pattern through that turnaround area.

37
38 On question, Mr. Voytilla informed Commissioner Maks that he is not certain of
39 the number of special needs buses that would be utilized at the site, adding that he
40 is sure that less than six special needs buses would be there. He pointed out that
41 the geometry of the cul-de-sac has been designed to make certain that the buses
42 could park at the curb and traffic would be able to travel around the buses. He
43 noted that a drop-off is also located at the southern end of the cul-de-sac, adding
44 that to the east of the proposed cafeteria, there is a similar curved curb line that
45 will also function as a drop-off area, adding that this area is being enhanced in an
46 effort to encourage drop-offs at both ends.

1 Emphasizing that the students would not utilize the crosswalks as intended,
2 Commissioner Maks pointed out that they walk diagonally and sideways and that
3 active enforcement is the only way to get the students to use the crosswalks. He
4 mentioned that he would prefer a right-hand turn lane, rather than the pedestrian
5 bulb, and questioned whether there is adequate room to install a right-hand turn
6 lane with a queuing capacity for three vehicles, which could effectively relieve
7 some of the congestion.

8
9 Observing that he is not comfortable guessing on this type of issue, Mr. Springer
10 noted that he understands what Commissioner Maks is attempting to accomplish.

11
12 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that the issues could be appropriately
13 addressed by leaving adequate room for vehicles without being required to travel
14 through the bulb to drop off students.

15
16 Mr. Voytilla addressed Commissioner Maks' concern with the proposed
17 elimination of some of what is now public parking on SW Erickson Avenue in
18 order to provide parking for buses, observing that this issue had been debated. He
19 pointed out that the applicant had considered restricting this area for the morning
20 and afternoon periods when the buses arrive, emphasizing that there had been
21 concern with the possibility that some individuals might not comply with this
22 restriction. He explained that it had been determined that the easiest and safest
23 solution would be to restrict this area during school hours.

24
25 Commissioner Maks suggested conditioning this restriction for a shorter period of
26 time, pointing out that there are signs at Raleigh Hills Elementary School
27 prohibiting dropping off and allowing buses only during this period of time. He
28 noted that he agrees that parents fail to read signs, observing that the parents of
29 the Southridge High School students began obeying the "No Parking" signs when
30 their cars were towed.

31
32 Mr. Voytilla pointed out that the district is attempting to address the situations
33 they have identified at the school that are not working, emphasizing that the
34 parking situation would be monitored and that any necessary revisions would be
35 addressed.

36
37 Emphasizing that he has no concern with the parking for the sake of parking,
38 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of how the vehicles that are currently
39 entering and exiting the site to drop off students would continue to do so.

40
41 Referring to Figure 4 of the Traffic Report, Mr. Springer pointed out that the
42 number of vehicles turning right heading north on SW Erickson Street is not very
43 significant. Observing that there is no real need for a right-hand turn lane, he
44 noted that this would not serve much purpose.

45
46 Commissioner Maks suggested a 60-foot drop-off area on SW Erickson Street.

1 Observing that he would like to discuss this with the engineer, Mr. Springer
2 pointed out that there could be a way to provide a drop-off area adequate for two
3 or three vehicles to the south of the entrance.
4

5 Commissioner Maks suggested a Condition of Approval requiring that the
6 Beaverton School District would provide a student drop-off area, 60-feet in length
7 (three car lengths), at some location on SW Erickson Street. Emphasizing that
8 this area is supposed to function appropriately, he noted that the diagonal parking
9 he had proposed would help to serve this function.
10

11 Commissioner Bliss mentioned that while the cul-de-sac bulb provides an
12 adequate turning radius for buses, there are up to six special education buses
13 parked at the curb.
14

15 Mr. Voytilla pointed out that these special education buses are not all on the site
16 at the same time, adding that their arrivals are staggered and they are only at the
17 site for a brief period of time.
18

19 Vice-Chairman Barnard reminded Mr. Springer and Mr. Voytilla that it is
20 necessary to complete and submit yellow testimony cards.
21

22 Mr. Voytilla clarified that because Beaverton High School is a closed campus,
23 students would not be allowed to park in undesignated areas, emphasizing that the
24 students are required to park at a location on the campus. He further explained
25 that student cars are within a gated area during school hours, adding that the
26 ungated parking areas are for visitors and staff only.
27

28 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

29

30 **EDNA STARKE** mentioned that her home is located to the south of the proposed
31 parking lot, adding that she is concerned with health issues that could potentially
32 be created by the exhaust fumes emitted by the buses. She pointed out that
33 because her small wooden fence does not extend all the way to SW Erickson
34 Street, she would like the applicant to install a tall fence to provide security and
35 screening for her yard. Emphasizing that she had actually moved here in 1968
36 due to air pollution issues that were affecting her husband's health, she noted that
37 she is concerned with the proposal to locate a parking lot near her back yard. She
38 observed that some sort of screening is necessary to prevent the lights from
39 shining into her home, adding that she is also concerned with the size of the
40 proposed shrubs at the time of planting. Observing that she had discussed her
41 concerns with both Ms. Kirkman and Mr. Angelo, she expressed her opinion that
42 it does not appear that her concerns are being addressed appropriately.
43

44 At the request of Vice-Chairman Barnard, Ms. Edna Starke's daughter-in-law,
45 **SHANNON STARKE**, indicated the location of her home on the map. She

1 expressed concern that her mother-in-law would be visited by her grandchildren,
2 who have allergies and asthma-related illnesses.

3
4 Vice-Chairman Barnard requested that Ms. Shannon Starke also complete and
5 submit a yellow testimony card.

6
7 Ms. Edna Starke reiterated her concerns with a fence, observing that she would
8 like the applicant to provide at least a ten-foot concrete or brick wall fence along
9 the property line.

10
11 Ms. Shannon Starke explained that the existing fence does not extend all of the
12 way to SW Erickson Street, expressing her opinion that the fence should extend
13 all of the way to the sidewalk to prevent the students from driving on her mother-
14 in-law's lawn in order to exit the parking area.

15
16 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of what purpose the requested tall
17 wall along the property line would serve.

18
19 Ms. Edna Starke advised Commissioner Maks that she is requesting this tall wall
20 along her property line to prevent the noise and exhaust fumes from entering her
21 home.

22
23 Commissioner Maks assured Ms. Edna Starke that the City's design standards
24 would regulate the design of the lights in such a way that they would not intrude
25 significantly upon her property. He further explained that the design aspect of
26 this particular proposal would be considered at a meeting of the Board of Design
27 Review, adding that it would be in her best interests to address her concerns at
28 that Public Hearing as well. On question, he advised Ms. Shannon Starke that it is
29 practically the standard operating procedure to design the lighting in a way that
30 would not intrude upon the adjacent properties.

31
32 Observing that the Planning Commission reviews the proposal for the conditional
33 use in a general manner, Vice-Chairman Barnard explained that the Board of
34 Design Review would then review and condition the specifics with regard to
35 issues such as the lighting and the size and type of shrubs to be planted. He
36 requested that staff make certain that Ms. Edna Starke is provided with the
37 necessary information with regard to the date and time of the Public Hearing
38 before the Board of Design Review.

39
40 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of how far west of the site Ms.
41 Starke's property is located.

42
43 Ms. Shannon Starke indicated the location of Ms. Edna Starke's property on the
44 illustration
45

1 Commissioner Johansen pointed out that there is another property located to the
2 west on the south side adjacent to proposed parking lot, requesting clarification of
3 whether this property would be impacted as well.
4

5 Ms. Edna Starke expressed her opinion that her home is the only one that would
6 be significantly impacted by this proposed parking lot, adding that this could
7 potentially decrease the value of her property.
8

9 Vice-Chairman Barnard informed Ms. Edna Starke that it is necessary to provide
10 documented information indicating that the proposal would decrease the value of
11 her property, adding that this information could either be provided to the Planning
12 Commission at this time or to the Board of Design Review during their Public
13 Hearing.
14

15 **HENRY KANE** addressed the Planning Commission's denial of the SV 2001-
16 0003 – Beaverton High School Street Vacation, which is related to this particular
17 proposal, expressing his opinion that the City of Beaverton appears to be
18 struggling with the preparation of an ordinance that would stand scrutiny by the
19 Circuit Court that would not be appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals
20 (LUBA). He pointed out that the public interest statute provides that the street can
21 be closed only if the proposal is within the public interest. Emphasizing that this
22 issue involves a 27-acre site, five acres of which only appears to be utilized for
23 grass, he pointed out that while the buses are currently stacking up on SW 2nd
24 Street, the proposed closure would create a mess on SW Erickson Street and
25 create severe damage to the traffic circulation. Observing that no action can be
26 taken until Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) provides permission, he
27 noted that the State Fire Code requires that equal access must be provided.
28 Noting that their first concern is with public health and safety, he expressed his
29 opinion that it is doubtful that TVF&R would agree to block a through street.
30

31 Vice-Chairman Barnard advised Mr. Kane that the decision with regard to the
32 Street Vacation has already been made, emphasizing that this is not the subject of
33 this Public Hearing.
34

35 Mr. Kane stated that he is aware that the decision with regard to the Street
36 Vacation has already been made and is not the subject of this Public Hearing,
37 adding that TVF&R is duty bound by the State Fire Code to insist upon
38 appropriate access, which can only be provided by this street. He pointed out that
39 it is not appropriate for a cafeteria to block the highway without access for fire
40 and safety vehicles.
41

42 **TYLER RADDU** mentioned that he is a former school bus driver for Beaverton
43 High School and described the sizes of the school buses, pointing out that while
44 the older school buses are 40-42 feet long, approximately the length of 2½ cars,
45 the new buses are 45 feet long, approximately three car lengths. Observing that
46 loading and unloading wheelchair ramps takes time, he pointed out that those

1 mini-buses would be parked there for quite a while and leave at approximately the
2 same time. He noted that while there were formerly two columns of 13 buses, for
3 a total of 26 buses, now there are 11 and 10 buses, for a total of 21 buses, adding
4 that there appears to be several buses missing. He mentioned that because the
5 buses are parked in different spots every day, the students would need time to
6 locate their buses. He discussed the team buses, observing that these buses arrive
7 early to pick up the teams that would be traveling to various games, as well as the
8 field trip buses that arrive late due to afternoon traffic issues, emphasizing that
9 this would all create additional traffic and parking complications on SW Stott
10 Street and SW Erickson Street.

11
12 Expressing his appreciation to Mr. Raddu for his information, Commissioner
13 Pogue requested clarification of how long ago Beaverton High School utilized 26
14 buses.

15
16 Mr. Raddu advised Commissioner Pogue that Beaverton High School had utilized
17 26 buses a year ago, noting that Southridge High School had been operating at the
18 time.

19
20 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of what time the buses for Merlo
21 Station High School and C. E. Mason (Arts and Communication) High School
22 arrive at Beaverton High School.

23
24 Mr. Raddu explained that these buses pick up the students in the morning at their
25 home bus stops and drop them off at Merlo Station High School and C. E. Mason
26 High School, noting that in the afternoon, both of these schools are dismissed at
27 2:10 p.m., allowing for only 20 minutes travel time for the buses to reach
28 Beaverton High School in order for these students to transfer to the appropriate
29 buses to take them home. He emphasized that because the buses from Merlo
30 Station High School and C. E. Mason High School don't always reach Beaverton
31 High School in time, these students often are unable to make the connection and
32 transfer to the buses that take them to their homes.

33
34 Vice-Chairman Barnard expressed his appreciation to Mr. Raddu for the
35 information he provided.

36
37 **APPLICANT REBUTTAL:**

38
39 Mr. Angelo referred to the comments of Ms. Edna Starke and Ms. Shannon
40 Starke, pointing out that the lighting issue is addressed within the Development
41 Code. He noted that the applicant has nothing more to add with regard to their
42 issues, observing that these issues would be addressed at the Board of Design
43 Review Hearing scheduled for May 8, 2002. Referring to the existing wooden
44 fence which does not extend to SW Erickson Street, he mentioned that the
45 Beaverton School District is willing to extend this six-foot wooden fence up to
46 SW Erickson Street, as requested by Ms. Edna Starke. He discussed the

1 landscaping materials between the proposed development and Ms. Edna Starke's
2 property, observing that the applicant is willing to consider a different variety of
3 plant materials, most likely a hardier shrub that would grow faster and more
4 aggressively than the existing vegetation, and that this would be reviewed prior to
5 the Board of Design Review Hearing. He noted that the plans have been
6 coordinated with TVF&R, adding that they had been involved in the Facilities
7 Review process and had indicated that they were process with the proposed access
8 for both parking lots.

9
10 Mr. Angelo discussed Mr. Raddu's comments, pointing out that the plans had
11 been reviewed with the transportation staff of the Beaverton School District in
12 terms of circulation and bus parking. Emphasizing that the high school serves as
13 both an activity center and community center that attracts students and visitors, he
14 noted that the applicant is comfortable with the proposed distribution of bus
15 parking.

16
17 Commissioner Young requested clarification of the typical number of passengers
18 on a school bus.

19
20 Mr. Voytilla explained that while he does have the information with regard to the
21 exact number of students served by each bus, the number quoted has been
22 adequate for 2,200 students projected for campus.

23
24 Commissioner Johansen questioned the height of the fence by Ms. Edna Starke's
25 property.

26
27 Mr. Angelo described Ms. Edna Starke's fence as a six-foot wooden alternating
28 board, good neighbor type fence, observing that the existing fence is in relatively
29 good condition.

30
31 Commissioner Maks mentioned that the shrubbery placed along the fence and the
32 school parking lot would typically screen headlights and prevent glare from
33 spilling onto adjoining properties, emphasizing that often plant materials that
34 grow higher and quicker do not actually serve as a screen.

35
36 **PUBLIC REBUTTAL TO APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL:**

37
38 Vice-Chairman Barnard pointed out that public rebuttal of applicant's rebuttal IS
39 restricted to new matters raised in applicant's rebuttal to public testimony.

40
41 Ms. Shannon Starke mentioned that she would like to address the issue with
42 regard to continuing the fence out to SW Erickson Street, expressing her opinion
43 that this would not be adequate without extending the fence all the way around
44 SW Erickson Street and towards SW 5th Street.

45

1 Ms. Edna Starke expressed her opinion that a wooden fence would not screen
2 noise, pollution or lights, emphasizing that she would prefer a concrete fence.

3
4 Ms. Kirkman referred to Development Code Section 60.20.10.6, and clarified that
5 the exceeded parking ratios have been addressed, observing that while the
6 Planning Commission is authorized to require additional parking for a CUP, less
7 would require a Variance. She explained that the Board of Design Review would
8 address the fencing issue, observing that property values is not addressed within
9 the approval criteria. Concluding, she pointed out that TVF&R has reviewed the
10 application and determined that adequate emergency access is available.

11
12 Mr. Gustafson noted that the raised concrete pedestrian crossings that have been
13 proposed do not quite meet applicable standards, clarifying that specifying that
14 these crossings be raised would only create further difficulties and that it would
15 be appropriate for the applicant to propose a better means of addressing this issue.
16 Referring to the proposed pedestrian plaza, he noted that such a facility does
17 encourage public transit for students and members of the public.

18
19 On question, City Attorney Ted Naemura indicated that he had no comments with
20 regard to this application.

21
22 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

23
24 8:56 p.m. to 9:03 p.m. -- break.

25
26 Commissioner Young stated that he had reviewed and concluded that the findings
27 in the Staff Report are appropriate, adding that he would support a motion for
28 approval of the application, although he is interested in additional Conditions of
29 Approval.

30
31 Commissioner Bliss pointed out that while he is in favor of the proposed
32 expansion, he is unable to approve a proposal that does not meet the Development
33 Code. He mentioned that he would be willing to approve the application subject
34 to an agreement with Tri-Met with regard to the ten percent parking reduction. In
35 response to Mr. Naemura's offer to address this issue, he stated that he would like
36 this to be addressed after hearing from his fellow Commissioners.

37
38 Emphasizing that many issues had been raised during the Public Hearing for the
39 Street Vacation, Commissioner Johansen observed that he had not supported that
40 application due to the potential impact on the intersection of SW Erickson Street
41 and SW Farmington Road. Expressing his opinion that the applicant has not met
42 the criteria with regard to the burden of proof for the ten percent parking
43 reduction, he stated that he is unable to approve the application, which he feels is
44 inconsistent with regional goals. He pointed out that it is obvious that parking
45 demand is not affected by the availability of public transit or a pedestrian plaza,
46 adding that although he understands the difficulty in expanding this particular site,

1 the proposal is to build out, rather than up, which is not consistent with an urban
2 type of high school.

3
4 Commissioner Pogue expressed his agreement with Mr. Johansen's statements
5 with regard to the pedestrian plaza, adding that although he supports the
6 application, he would like to hear from the City Attorney prior to making a
7 decision. Observing that he is also in favor of Commissioner Maks' suggestion
8 for allocating a student drop-off location, he pointed out that he is not in favor of
9 limiting the availability of the parking space, adding that the use of this area
10 should be determined by the Beaverton School District.

11
12 Commissioner Maks concurred with the comments of his fellow Commissioners,
13 observing that with regard to the traffic, this application involves a CUP for a
14 cafeteria. Pointing out that he understands concern with additional traffic, he
15 expressed his disagreement with Commissioner Johansen and stated that the
16 Street Vacation, rather than the CUP, would create this situation. He noted that
17 the proposal would enhance both Beaverton High School and the community.
18 Concluding, he expressed his support of the application, emphasizing that he
19 would like to include some additional Conditions of Approval to address certain
20 issues.

21
22 Vice-Chairman Barnard expressed his support of the application, adding that he is
23 also in favor of the proposed pedestrian plaza. Referring to Ms. Edna Starke's
24 request for a fence, he noted that while he appreciates good interaction between
25 neighbors, the request should be proportionate to what is being done at the site.

26
27 Mr. Naemura responded to concerns with regard to the proposed pedestrian plaza,
28 referring to a two-step analysis of this issue, as follows:

- 29
- 30 1. It is evident that this is language appropriate for a Condition of Approval,
31 and the Planning Commission is responsible to make certain that the
32 condition is actually possible. Testimony from Mr. Angelo illustrates that
33 there is space on the site plan that is large enough to accommodate a 300-
34 square foot facility, as provided within the Development Code
35 requirement, indicating that this condition is actually feasible.
 - 36
37 2. With regard to providing for the actual language of the condition, since it
38 appears that this facility could be adequately accommodated on the site
39 plan, it is necessary to create a Condition of Approval that contains
40 language that appropriately addresses the intent of the Planning
41 Commission and the Development Code.

42
43 Mr. Sparks suggested providing a Condition of Approval with regard to the
44 proposed pedestrian transit plaza, adding that this should specify a size of no less
45 than 300 square feet, while leaving the design details up to the discretion of the
46 Board of Design Review. He also suggested that a Condition of Approval for a

1 fence should provide general language for a structural or physical separation
2 between the proposed parking lot and Ms. Edna Starke's property, adding that the
3 design issues for this fence also be left up to the discretion of the Board of Design
4 Review.

5
6 Vice-Chairman Barnard expressed his agreement with Mr. Sparks' suggestion
7 with regard to the proposed pedestrian transit plaza and Ms. Edna Starke's request
8 for a fence.

9
10 Commissioner Maks disagreed with Mr. Sparks' suggestion with regard to the
11 proposed pedestrian transit plaza and Ms. Edna Starke's request for a fence.

12
13 Mr. Sparks discussed compatibility and design issues with regard to Ms. Edna
14 Starke's request for a fence, observing while that creating a barrier between the
15 proposed parking lot and the residence involves compatibility, the appearance and
16 materials involves design issues.

17
18 Expressing his agreement with Mr. Sparks, Commissioner Maks pointed out that
19 the Planning Commission is responsible for determining proportionality and
20 compatibility. He noted that while the Board of Design Review might determine
21 that a cement wall would provide an appropriate barrier, because this would not
22 be proportionate to the proposed development or necessary for reasonable
23 compatibility, in his opinion, the Planning Commission has the authority to
24 determine the height and material of this barrier or fence.

25
26 Commissioner Johansen commented that while access is an issue for a CUP
27 whether it is a new or expanded use, it is within the purview of the Planning
28 Commission to require additional access. He pointed out that he does not agree
29 with Commissioner Maks' statement that the traffic issues that have been
30 addressed by the Street Vacation are not subject to consideration with this CUP
31 application. He expressed his opinion that a certain level of creativity exists with
32 attempting to demonstrate that there is a justifiable basis for granting parking
33 reduction based upon available transit service.

34
35 Commissioner Bliss stated that he finds it difficult to condition a parking
36 reduction based upon something that might not actually occur, emphasizing that
37 other applicants are required to provide all of the necessary information and
38 background data that has not been provided with this application. He referred to
39 Development Code Section 6.20.10.10.A.2(e) and Section 6.20.10.10.A.3.f,
40 pointing out that any applicant requesting this parking reduction should provide
41 the appropriate supporting documentation. He emphasized that he is concerned
42 with the functionality of this proposed pedestrian plaza, rather than the color or
43 size of the benches or other design issues. Concluding, he stated that although he
44 supports Beaverton High School, he is opposed to this application.

45

1 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Young **SECONDED** a motion
2 to approve CUP 2001-0031 – Beaverton High School Cafeteria and Parking Lot
3 Expansion Conditional use Permit, based upon the testimony, reports and
4 exhibits, new evidence presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and
5 upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report
6 dated March 13, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 5, and
7 including additional Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 4, and adding
8 additional Conditions of Approval, as follows:
9

- 10 6. The Beaverton School District shall provide a student drop off of
11 approximately 60 feet on SW Erickson Street, adjacent to Beaverton High
12 School.
13
- 14 7. The applicant shall provide a pedestrian plaza, as defined in Development
15 Code Section 60.20.10.A.2. This pedestrian plaza must be open to the
16 public and be at least 300 square feet and provide landscaping and a trash
17 receptacle, as well as a transit shelter, if required by Tri-Met.
18
- 19 8. The applicant shall provide a wooden barrier along the southern property
20 line of the southern parking lot to SW Erickson Street to provide screening
21 for the adjacent property owners, the height and design of which is to be
22 determined by the Board of Design Review.
23

24 Mr. Sparks requested clarification of Condition of Approval No. 8, specifically
25 whether the fence would extend only to SW Erickson Street or also down to SW
26 5th Street, as requested by Ms. Edna Starke.
27

28 Commissioner Maks clarified that this fence would extend only to SW Erickson
29 Street.
30

31 Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a
32 motion to amend the motion to include Condition of Approval No. 9, as follows:
33

- 34 9. The number of outside parking spaces will be no fewer than 480.
35

36 Commissioner Johansen explained the purpose of his proposed amendment and
37 additional Condition of Approval, observing that this would allow this issue to be
38 addressed in a future action at the option of the applicant.
39

40 Commissioner Maks suggested that conditioning 480 additional parking spaces
41 would require the applicant to appear again before the Planning Commission to
42 modify the CUP, expressing his opinion that this Condition of Approval would
43 not accomplish anything.
44

1 Mr. Naemura observed that an inherent conflict exists between the main motion
2 and the proposed amendment to the motion, adding the active motion-making
3 process could not address and resolve this issue.
4

5 Vice-Chairman Barnard requested a two-minute session with the City Attorney
6 for clarification purposes.
7

8 Commissioner Maks suggested that this issue could be resolved by calling the
9 question on the proposed amendment.
10

11 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of the conflict of the main motion
12 and the proposed amendment.
13

14 Mr. Naemura pointed out that the amendment to the motion challenges the
15 sufficiency of the motion to stand on evidence, observing that this involves what
16 he referred to as “dueling motions”.
17

18 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that this does not involve a
19 “dueling motion”.
20

21 Mr. Naemura reiterated that there is a significant conflict between the main
22 motion and the proposed amendment.
23

24 Motion on the amendment to the main motion providing for the proposed
25 additional Condition of Approval No. 9 **FAILED** by the following roll call vote:
26

27 **AYES:** Bliss and Johansen.
28

29 **NAYS:** Barnard, Maks, Pogue and Young.
30

31 Commissioner Young discussed the potential impacts of Street Vacations,
32 observing that the decision with regard to the related application for a Street
33 Vacation has been made. He pointed out that the request for the proposed
34 reduction in parking should demonstrate that the criteria had been adequately
35 addressed.
36

37 Commissioner Johansen expressed his agreement with Commissioner Young,
38 noting that the parking analysis must demonstrate that vehicle parking demand
39 would be adequately met with the reduced parking. He expressed his concern that
40 it is dangerous to disregard this particular requirement in approving a reduction in
41 parking.
42

43 Vice-Chairman Barnard acknowledged Commissioner Johansen’s comments,
44 clarifying that the issue now involves the main motion, including the three
45 additional Conditions of Approval, as proposed by Commissioner Maks.
46

1 Motion **CARRIED**, by the following roll call vote:

2
3 **AYES:** Barnard, Maks, Pogue and Young

4
5 **NAYS:** Bliss and Johansen.

6
7 9:51 p.m. -- Mr. Sparks, Ms. Kirkman, Mr. Gustafson and Mr. Naemura left.

8
9 9:52 p.m. to 9:55 p.m. – break.

10
11 Chairman Voytilla returned to the dais.

12
13 Commissioner Barnard returned the gavel to Chairman Voytilla.

14
15 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

16
17 Minutes of the meeting of March 6, 2002, submitted. Chairman Voytilla
18 requested that line 20 of page 13 be amended, as follows: "...very involved with
19 the ~~last~~ **next** two projects..." Commissioner Young requested that line 2 of page
20 19 be amended, as follows: "...whether these facilities are **relative to a grid of**
21 530 square feet." Commissioner Young requested that line 5 of page 19 be
22 amended, as follows: "...Southridge High School is ~~in excess~~ **relative to a grid**
23 of 530 square feet..." Commissioner Bliss **MOVED** and Commissioner Young
24 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved, as amended.

25
26 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Johansen,
27 who abstained from voting on this issue.

28
29 Minutes of the meeting of March 13, 2002, submitted. Commissioner Johansen
30 requested that line 25 of page 4 be amended, as follows: "He pointed out that an
31 ~~appellate~~ **appellant** could go to a great deal of effort..." Commissioner Young
32 **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
33 approved, as amended

34
35 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Pogue,
36 who abstained from voting on this issue.

37
38 Minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2002, submitted. Commissioner Bliss
39 **MOVED** and Commissioner Johansen **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
40 approved as written.

41
42 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

43
44 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

45
46 The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

1 **WORK SESSION:**

2

3 **A. SCENIC TREE PROJECT**

4 Discussion of open house event on April 13, 2002. Introduce the Scenic
5 Tree Inventory data.

6

7 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer requested a continuance of the Work Session until
8 May 1, 2002, observing that there are no items on that agenda at this time, adding
9 that she would like to provide some additional items of information for review
10 prior to that time. She also requested the Commissioners to think about how they
11 would like staff to present this information with regard to a specific application.
12 She urged the Commissioners to consider the various criteria that had been
13 developed last year, including how to weight categories and determine which are
14 significant resources. Referring to the Open House with regard to the Scenic Tree
15 Project that had been held at the Library on April 13, 2002, she pointed out that
16 over 11,000 postcards had been mailed out and that approximately 300
17 individuals had attended this Open House, many of whom had returned responses
18 to the surveys that had been distributed.

19

20 In response to a question by Commissioner Barnard, Ms. Fryer clarified that staff
21 had scheduled hourly presentations in the Conference Room at the Library,
22 followed by a question and answer session. Meeting Rooms "A" and "B" were
23 set up with maps and resource information.

24

25 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that he had received one testimony card with regard
26 to this issue from Mr. Bob Ringo, requesting that staff notify him of the scheduled
27 time and location for the continuance.

28

29 Commissioner Johansen suggested that staff could provide information with
30 regard to the appropriate map locations referenced in communications from the
31 public.

32

33 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Johansen that the letters would be discussed at a
34 later time, when an actual Comprehensive Plan Amendment has been proposed.

35

36 The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.